

ATD



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/996,176	11/27/2001	Evan R. Green	42390P10393	2243

8791 7590 07/30/2003

BLAKELY SOKOLOFF TAYLOR & ZAFMAN
12400 WILSHIRE BOULEVARD, SEVENTH FLOOR
LOS ANGELES, CA 90025

EXAMINER

WILLIAMS, HOWARD L

ART UNIT PAPER NUMBER

2819

DATE MAILED: 07/30/2003

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/996,176

Applicant(s)

GREEN, EVAN R.

Examiner

Howard L Williams

Art Unit

2819

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE three MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☐ Responsive to communication(s) filed on ____.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 6-21 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) ____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) ____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 6-21 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) ____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) ____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on ____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
- Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- 11) ☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on ____ is: a) ☐ approved b) ☐ disapproved by the Examiner.
- If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.
- 12) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

- 13) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. ____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 14) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).
- a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.
- 15) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) ____.
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). ____.
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: _____.

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 6-21 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Smith (US 5,444,864) in view of Kenworthy (US 5,691,978) and Lansford et al. (Wi-Fi(802.119b) and Bluetooth: Enabling Coexistence.

Smith discloses a system for active cancellation of interference in RF systems. Smith notes that it is well known to arrange RF system to either make use of the same antenna or separate transmit and receive antennas in close proximity to each other. (col. 1 lines 16-23). The Smith interference cancellation arrangement samples a portion of the transmit signal (28; fig. 1) and receive signal 32 and supplies each of these signals to signal processing circuit (12; fig. 1) to provide a gain and phase matched signal to the coupled or leak-through interference signal. The gain and phase matched signal (36; fig. 1) is fed to one input of a subtraction circuit to substantially cancel the interference signal in the receive path. Smith does not disclose analog-to-digital converters in the transmit path nor digital-to-analog converters in the receive path with digital signals being the signals being the input the adaptive cancellation circuit.

Kenworthy discloses an RF communication systems which uses antenna positioning, RF cancellation and adaptive cancellation at the baseband frequency to mitigate coupled and reflected interference from the desired RF signal of interest in the receive path. The adaptive baseband cancellation taps digital signals from the transmit path (fig. 3) --the converters are noted as optional or if necessary -- for gain and phase matching a portion of the transmit signal in a processing circuit (43; fig. 3) for coupled and reflected interference cancellation in the receive path. The optional and if necessary nature of the converters for the cancellation signal and receive path further demonstrate that digital transceiver circuitry is known and the use of digital processing

for its respective benefits over analog processing are well known and would have been obvious.

The Lansford et al. article discusses coexistence of signals meeting the IEEE 802.11 standard and Bluetooth (IEEE 802.15) standard. In general Lansford teaches that interference between these signals is not unexpected. More specifically Lansford teaches collisions happen at the physical layer (page 26, left column, last paragraph) and suggests "Only by the use of signal processing techniques in the PHY layer can the Bluetooth signal be excised from the 802.11(b) passband...."

Smith and Kenworthy do not disclose their RF system as including IEEE 802.11(b) or 815.1 "Bluetooth" standards transmission. However, the application of known interference cancellation to relatively new RF spectrum that does nothing to change the technique would have been obvious to one of skill in the art because the issue of cross coupling in systems having co-located antennas would still exist.

Applicant's arguments with respect to claims have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire **THREE MONTHS** from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within **TWO MONTHS** of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the **THREE-MONTH** shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any


Application No: 09/996,176
Your Reference: 42390P10393
Art Unit: 2819

4

extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication should be directed to Howard L. Williams at telephone number 703-308-1679.

7/15/03


Howard L. Williams
Primary Examiner
Art Unit 2819